

27th August 1926]

4.—(a) & (b) What is referred to is apparently the right and not left flood bank. An estimate for diverting the Cauvery right flood bank from the Municipal Pumping station to the Kodamurti bridge was approved by Government in October 1925; but the exact distance between the original flood bank and the proposed flood bank is not known.

(c) to (f) The question whether the construction of a new flood bank entails on the Government a liability to compensate the holders of lands between the old and the new flood banks is under examination.

Repairs to the Manur channel in Tinnevely taluk.

* 2362 Q.—Mr. CHAVADI K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI: With reference to question No. 2130 [clauses (a) to (c) and (e) to (g)], regarding complete repairs to the Manur channel in Tinnevely taluk of the Tinnevely district, which is under contemplation for many years, and answered at the meeting held on 16th July 1926, will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any report has been received from the departments concerned of the Government on the subject; and

(b) if so, to place the same on the Council table at its next meeting to be held in August 1926?

A.—Yes. The Government have received a report. The facts are as follows. As a result of investigation by the Tank Restoration Scheme Party in 1916, an estimate for general improvements to the Manur channel amounting to Rs. 62,000 was prepared in 1917. Owing to the fact that the ayacut under the channel is partly Government and partly estate land, it was necessary to distribute the cost and the Collector was asked to arrange for a contribution from the proprietors concerned, viz., the Zamindar of Uthumalai and the Inamdar of Kokkuparaikulam.

At that time (1918) the Collector did not regard the matter as urgent, and the proposals were shelved. The matter was taken up again in 1923, at the instance of the then Collector and it was reported that the estimate would, at current rates, come to Rs. 85,000. Meanwhile the question of contribution has become complicated by the fact that the Uthumalai Estate is now in the hands of a Receiver appointed by the District Court, and doubts have arisen regarding his capacity to bind the Estate in the matter. This question is still under correspondence between the Collector and the Public Works Department. Steps are also being taken to assess the shares to which each party is liable, which have been provisionally put by the Executive Engineer at—

	PER CENT.
(i) Uthumalai	22.23
(ii) Kokkuparaikulam	4.03
(iii) Government	73.74

In the meantime, the Executive Engineer has, in the exercise of his powers, sanctioned estimates for silt clearance and repair of breaches from time to time as required. No estimate has been sanctioned in the current year.

[27th August 1926]

11-15
a.m.

Mr. Chavadi K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI:—"With reference to the statement in the answer given that doubts have arisen regarding the capacity of the Receiver to bind the Estate in the matter, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have obtained the necessary legal opinion, viz., the opinion of the Advocate-General, on the matter?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"I do not quite catch the hon. Member. I am not quite sure on what point legal opinion should be obtained."

Mr. Chavadi K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI:—"Regarding the power of the Receiver to bind the Estate in the matter of contribution to the repairs of the Manur channel, etc.?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"I do not understand to what question he is referring."

Mr. Chavadi K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI:—"It is stated in the answer to this question:

'At that time (1918) the Collector did not regard the matter as urgent, and the proposals were shelved. The matter was taken up again in 1923, at the instance of the then Collector and it was reported that the estimate would, at current rates, come to Rs. 55,000. Meanwhile the question of contribution has become complicated by the fact that the Uthumalai estate is now in the hands of a Receiver appointed by the District Court, and doubts have arisen regarding his capacity to bind the Estate in the matter.'

"Have Government taken legal opinion on the matter, Sir?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"Then, I would ask the hon. Member to go on to the next sentence in the answer, which says that the matter is still under correspondence. So far as that is concerned, legal opinion can be taken only after a decision is arrived at."

Closing of breaches in the banks of the Tambraparni river.

* 2363 Q.—Mr. Chavadi K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI: With reference to question No. 2180 [i and ii, (a) to (n)], regarding the closing of certain breaches in the banks of the Tambraparni river, and answered at the meeting held on 16th July 1926, will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to lay on the Council table any report received on the subject from the departments concerned at the next meeting of the Council in August 1926?

A.—The report^a of the Executive Engineer dated 2nd July 1926 is laid on the table.

Appointment of a Special officer for coolies working in the Mettur Project.

* 2364 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether any Special officer was appointed to look after the coolies, who are working in the Mettur Project as far as sanitation, house accommodation, wages, etc., are concerned;